

THE
AUTHOR
PUBLISHER
PRINTER
COMPLEX

Gill

PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

Richard Fasten

Oct. 1940

Corvallis, Ore

By Robert S. Gill

THE

AUTHOR

PUBLISHER

PRINTER

COMPLEX

Baltimore

THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS COMPANY

1940

COPYRIGHT, 1940
THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS COMPANY

Made in the United States of America

Published April, 1940

COMPOSED AND PRINTED AT THE
WAVERLY PRESS, INC.
FOR
THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

Contents

THE CONCEPTS PRINTING AND PUBLISHING.....	I
ROYALTIES AND SUCH.....	II
THE AUTHOR AS COLLABORATIVE PUBLISHER.....	19
THE SEPARATE FUNCTIONS OF AUTHOR AND PUBLISHER...	23
THE AUTHOR'S MANUSCRIPT.....	27
FAIR COPY.....	34
THE ENDS AND THE ODDMENTS.....	43
ILLUSTRATIONS.....	52
PROOF-READING AND READING PROOF.....	57
THE BOOK COMPLETE—AND REVISING IT.....	68

A Preface about Punctuation

No part of the scrivening herein purports to set forth the truth about punctuation (hyphenation included), nor have I any message to heave out to the world with regard to punctuation.

But the punctuation of what follows has been pretty vigilantly watched, and it represents (errors, omissions, and lapses owing to human frailty excepted) my considered idea of how English ought to be punctuated. To that extent the art of punctuation, as it has pleased the Fates to impart it to me, is exemplified.

No code of rules has been followed because of the conviction that no code yet devised or devisable is adequate and that the rigid pursuit of one must result in absurdities. This plasticity brings about superficial inconsistencies. Anyone who wishes to criticize the punctuation is authorized hereby to do so. But he should bring to his critique something meatier than the pointing out that this or that does not accord with Somebody's *Manual of Style*.

R. S. G.

I. *The Concepts Printing and Publishing*

OF THE making of books and periodicals there is no end—in sight. Several devices to take their place have been brought forward but, while each of them has a place in the scheme of dissemination of scientific or other information, none thus far can substitute for letter-press. Apparently the relationship of author-publisher-printer will outlast this generation at least.

Despite the fact that this thing has been going on a long time, many threads of the relationship are tangled. Few authors are practical printers; few have had experience in publishing. It is scarcely to be marveled at therefore that the author is quite in the dark as to the functions of his partners in literary production; or that this fact inclines to create annoyance, extra work, and extra expense for him. The publisher and printer are equally in the dark about the ins-and-outs of authoring, of course; but this makes less difference. It is the author who starts the ball rolling, and whether the course is straight or wabbling and uncertain depends greatly on the start.

The business of book-making is peculiarly rich in loose terminology. The same word is used now to

mean one thing, now something quite different. This is one of life's smaller pleasantries. The word *publishing* itself is a case in point. The artisan sets up a shop with one press and one font of type and announces himself as "publisher and printer." Here, evidently, publishing and printing are exact synonyms; and they are exact synonyms in the minds of many, in certain contexts. To *publish*, legally speaking, may mean no more than to exhibit or sell, or offer to exhibit or sell, a single copy of a work. *Published* as applied to questions of priority among scholars has never been defined, and there is a wide twilight zone.

So it is that a work can be, and sometimes is, published without printing or other means of duplication; and it can certainly be printed without publishing. To distinguish sharply between publishing and printing should not therefore be too difficult.

The printer is a manufacturer; the publisher, a merchandiser. The printer works on a contract—someone (often a publisher) orders him to produce so many copies of a book; the publisher has no such contract—he guesses how many copies the market will absorb and takes the risk of guessing wrong. Indeed he must *always* guess wrong; it is not possible to guess the precise number of copies; it is certain he will cause to be printed either too many or too few. But, assuming that he knows his business, his guess is more likely to be nearly right than someone else's guess—the author's, for instance.

The publisher has the task of choosing what to

publish, of determining how many copies to print, and of then disposing of those copies to the public, all of which entails a complex of advertising, announcement, record-keeping, credit-determination, distribution, retail-trade relationship, accounting, collection of moneys—in short, the erection of a rather complicated business structure. The printer enters into this complex only as a supplier.

This does not mean that the printer is a mere incident. The author himself is also a supplier, and he could not be called incidental. The printer contributes in most important ways. He must know how to make books, which is an art. He must know how to make them economically. He must coöperate closely with the author, and he has it within his power to sadden the author's life or make glad his heart.

Yet printing is not publishing. As measured by relative costs, printing is about a fourth or fifth part of publishing. Some people find this a bit hard to believe, but even a brief analysis makes it credible. A certain portion of the list price of a book never reaches the publisher's coffers at all. It disappears in discounts to the retail trade. In scientific publication this cost—a cost of distribution, of making the book available, making it public, i.e., *publishing* it—runs from twenty to twenty-five per cent of the list price; in fiction, belles lettres, and other like literary productions, it is much higher. The author is deserving of a royalty, and this absorbs another ten to twelve per cent. The business of making the book

known, entailing as it does not only the expense of purchase of advertising space, of mail announcements and other direct charges, but also employment of copy-writers, clerks, and salesmen, takes another twenty to twenty-five per cent. Costs chargeable to the general administration necessary to conduct a business, including employment of a staff, means another twelve to fifteen per cent. Thus, without any consideration whatever of profit to the publisher or of cost of manufacture, something like seventy per cent of the list price is accounted for. It is certain that, on some titles, the publisher must lose; equally certain that he must, to stay in business, compensate for the loss by a better-than-average gain on other titles.

When it is observed that printing is a minor fraction rather than virtually all of the whole cost of publishing, the demolition of some popular superstitions follows. One superstition has it that books would be much cheaper if bound in paper covers instead of cloth cases. In the case of a pamphlet of a few pages, it is true, the cost of cloth binding does loom relatively large. But the case binding of a book that is listed at \$5.00 costs thirty cents or less. The paper cover would cost eight to ten cents. The saving is not significant, and the reader gets a far less durable book. Another superstition has it that printing some portions of a book in a smaller type-face will work a wonder. It will save some cost, to be sure. But as it saves nothing whatever in the cost of composition, the effect is limited. Further-

more, as we have endeavored to make plain, any cost saved in *printing* applies only to a minor fraction of the whole cost of *publishing*, though this is no reason for not printing with a view to every possible economy.

Here one may pertinently inquire whether the publisher couldn't be dispensed with as an unnecessary middle-man, and let the author deal directly with the printer. There is no reason why it could not be done; but in such event either the author or the printer must become the publisher and be presently involved with all the costs of publishing as distinct from those of printing.

Indeed it has been done. At least one exceptional book has enjoyed a life of several editions without benefit of publisher. There are, moreover, certain situations in which the publisher is an intruder. A scientific society wishes—say for sentimental reasons—to publish a work of a not too ambitious sort. Almost the only sale will be to interested members of the society. It is a book which will be readily sold or not at all—i.e., it will not require persistent advertising. Such a title can be very inexpensively announced in society bulletins or round-robins from the secretary, and sales, while few, are almost automatic. A publisher has no right bargaining into such a picture. He has nothing to offer.

Parenthetically it may be remarked that occasionally a publisher is asked to lend his imprint to such a title, presumably because it looks better as the issue of a publisher. The publisher has no choice but

resolutely to decline. Putting his imprint on a book he is not publishing invites stray orders from trade-outlets and individuals, requests for bibliographic information or for review copies, and an amazing what-not of correspondence, to all of which he must make the lame reply "We aren't the publishers—we just *said* that."

Casual and occasional items may indeed be published without a publisher. Yet obviously the stream of publication could not be kept flowing without publishers. If we didn't have them, we should have to invent them. Publishing invariably requires an advance of funds. The publisher advances them, sometimes in full, but always in some part. He maintains a business organization year in and year out. He acts in some degree as editor, deciding what is and what is not publishable, what is worth publishing. He is often the means of bringing to public notice the talents of an author, to that author's glory or profit or both, and to the advancement of science, since the recognition of those talents often leads to a wider use of them. Not infrequently he spends money to publish when he is sure that from purely commercial reasoning he would do no such thing, in the hope of doing something creative, worth the doing. Not infrequently he takes a plunge and publishes something that contravenes orthodoxy of one sort or another—perhaps in the hope of making a name for himself as a bold and daring pioneer; and for this he risks being disagreeably associated with an undertaking that wasn't even half cocked.

But no publisher would go to his grave happy unless he had stuck out his neck at least once and had it nicely sliced; if it never did happen, he couldn't be sure that he really had had the spirit of adventure in him.

The distinction between publishing and printing may be readily seen in this also: the printer will print without question except as to the financial reliability of his customer. He will refuse nothing printable; he will balk only at sedition, treason, and outrages on decency. The publisher behaves in an exactly opposite fashion. He makes no inquiry into the financial standing of the author who presents his manuscript. But otherwise he is not nearly so broad-minded as his printer colleague. The subject matter of the manuscript must pass his scrutiny. It may be of some interest to set down some of the questions a publisher, in effect, addresses to a manuscript under consideration.

In science publishing, the first question is usually Is it science or voodooism? The science publisher is no expert in each of the several branches of science that manuscripts may represent, or even in any one of them. But he acquires a sixth sense (or maybe a sixteenth) that almost infallibly guides him. He learns to detect the odor of substantial general fallacy. He is seldom in doubt. When he is, help is available, as indicated in the ensuing paragraph.

Deciding that the manuscript is science, the publisher next inquires of it whether it is important—whether, in a word, publication is justified. Here

he asks the assistance of some person qualified to pass judgment, someone expert in the field represented by the manuscript. That such assistance is available and is readily given makes science publishing possible.

Satisfied on this point, the next is whether the subject-matter is of interest to a sufficient number of people to make the manuscript a commercial possibility. All too many manuscripts fail to pass this test. In the present state of the art of publishing, however, there is no help for it. Seldom can fewer than a thousand copies be contemplated as a commercial possibility; a smaller number boosts the unit cost too high and makes list price prohibitive. Usually the lower limit is even greater than a thousand.

One type of manuscript is peculiarly trying on a publisher's exercise of judgment; and there are more of this type than might be supposed. This is the manuscript that has a first-class idea for a background, but that fails, utterly or mainly, in bringing the idea into literary execution. These put the publisher on a very hot spot in his talks with the author. Sometimes he rashly commits himself to the idea before he sees the execution. In any case he cannot turn up his nose too far at the idea, for later someone may come in with the same idea properly executed, and he shrinks at the notion of seeming to double-cross himself. Yet it is brutal to tell an author that he simply can't do what the author believes a child can do—express himself. Delicate hints that the manuscript might be altered in such-and-such par-

ticulars usually fall on barren ground or even cause umbrage to be taken.

There usually (it is regrettable to say) comes the question Who wrote it? Perhaps it shouldn't make a difference, but it does. The difference is in sales resistance. The well-known name is in itself an advertisement. It means automatic attention for a book. It is realized that many will purchase it to see what so-and-so has to say, regardless of content. Yes, the big shot can get away with things that the unknown can't hope to. Human nature is that way. The author of one well-known widely-read book will not have to seek far for a publisher of another manuscript. On the other hand however, an author can be so prolific as to deflate his market; publishers shy away from the literary guinea-pig.

It does not follow that the unknown cannot get consideration. He can and he does. Of course his right to speak on the subject will be looked into, as it should be. A reasonable man will scarcely expect to speak in print unless something in his record gives him a right. Very often the gap between the unknown author and his prospective audience is bridged by the kindly intervention of someone known to both who contributes a foreword to bring them together. Here again, a warning may be sounded. There are those so much sought after as introducers, and so amiable, that their forewords are worth precisely nothing at all.

There are other ominous questions a manuscript must answer for itself. Is it couched in fairly decent

readable English? Has it been carelessly prepared? Is it constructed with reasonable care as a manuscript, or is it a hodge-podge, a mere suggestion of a manuscript that might possibly be made out of the assembled data? Finally (though mind you these queries aren't propounded in any particular order; they are made all in a breath, the answers to be sorted out as examination proceeds) *Is it in a form suitable for publication?*

It is rather ironic when, as not infrequently happens, a manuscript passes every other sort of scrutiny and must be rejected because of failure to live up to this last thing mentioned—ironic, because time, work, and worry have gone into the manuscript in virtually the same degree as would have caused it to be accepted; and somebody's time, work, and worry will now have to be repeated upon it, if it is ever to look a composition machine defiantly in the face.

III. *Royalties and Such*

SOMETIMES publisher and author get into quite heated dispute about the amount of royalty to be paid to the author. Authors have been heard to say that they would not accept from a publisher a contract calling for less than a royalty of thus-and-such. Publishers have been known to declare with venom that they would pay no author, regardless of who he is, more than such-and-thus.

This should be very amusing (yet nobody gets a laugh out of it) because the publisher really doesn't care a hang what the author's royalty is. Why should he? He hasn't the faintest intention of paying it. He is going to fix his list price so as to collect it, bit by bit, from the buying public, and he knows this perfectly well, even while he is fulminating.

The royalty is clearly not something for publisher and author to fight over. It may become something for them to plan together. Since the royalty must be paid ultimately by the customer, the customer's purse is a matter of prime consideration; a fair royalty is not one that emerges from a compromise between the publisher's cupidity and the author's insistence on his rights, but one that it is reasonable to suppose the customer is willing to pay. This is to say that, in practice, the royalty must be fitted into a

book's list price which in turn is limited by the customer. Lower list and a smaller percentage of royalty may well be to the advantage of the author. If it proves to be so, the publisher will share in the advantage also. Fixing a royalty may become a matter of intelligent guessing.

The basic truth about royalties is obscured because a quasi-standard royalty has become almost universal, and doubtless does well enough for the vast majority of book publications. The points to be kept in mind are that there is nothing sacrosanct about the standard, that special conditions may demand special royalty arrangements, and that author and publisher should both keep open minds on the subject.

Royalty is usually expressed in a percentage either of the list price or of the amount of money actually received by the publisher. The difference between the two is the amount that represents discounts to the retail trade. In science publishing, the publisher receives, on the average, about eighty per cent of the list price. But for any given title the amount received may be more or less than this. There is, of course, no way of telling in advance precisely how a title will behave in this particular.

Some publishers do not have methods of accounting that enable them to know what the aggregate price received is, for any given title over a period of time. These necessarily must base royalty on list price. But for those whose accounting methods permit, the basis of price received has been strongly recom-

mended, and the present tendency is toward that practice.

When the basis is price received, the percentage of royalty is correspondingly higher, so that the resulting dollars and cents will be virtually the same in either case. This basis is no doubt much the more consistent. Royalties are normally paid in cash and there is no direct relationship between cash and the number of books sold, while there is such a relationship between cash and the cash received. It is also probably fairer to both author and publisher. And it is certainly much more flexible. A publisher may have opportunity to sell a quantity-lot of copies, if he can make a very special quotation, a quotation so low as to prohibit the payment of a contracted royalty on list price. The publisher must therefore procure the agreement of the author to take a smaller royalty per copy in the special circumstances, or the deal cannot be closed. The author usually does agree—but he may be in South America or Kamchatka, and the deal cools off while he is being consulted. In any case the publisher's hands are freer if the contract calls for a percentage of price received. No delay whatever is entailed, and delay even of a day or two is often enough to ruin a negotiation. Thus such a simple thing as the basis of royalty-payment may cost both author and publisher money.

Sales in quantity-lots nearly always operate to get the author fewer cents per copy—but more dollars,

of course, on the whole. Books are often exported in quantity at a relatively low price per copy, in sheet form, and here too the royalty per copy is smaller. The publisher's margin is also smaller, for the same reason. It is best to regard such sales as a by-product, a pick-up on the side, and pin the attention on the gross amount rather than on the amount per copy.

It is fair for an author to ask a publisher to allow for a sliding scale of royalties, in the contract. The sliding scale is more easily illustrated than described. It means, e.g., a royalty of twelve per cent of price received on sales up to 5000 copies, fifteen per cent on sales between 5000 and 10000, seventeen per cent over 10000. Variation in the figures is all but infinite. It is fair because, as the sales increase, the publisher's unit costs decrease; the spread between the costs and the amount received becomes wider; the publisher begins to profit handsomely, and the author has a reasonable expectation of sharing in the money rewards that accrue.

It is also fair (though perhaps not as clearly so to the author) that the scale should begin with zero. If it is right that the author should share in the higher rewards of a book that goes into larger sales-figures, it is reasonable to ask him to share in the hazard that it will not sell enough copies to pay its initial costs. Royalties are earnings. Earnings are not paid according to the merit of an author, or his needs, or the amount of drudgery he has put into his task, for the excellent reason that earnings are cash and

none of these things necessarily produces it. Earnings are made possible only when a person or a multitude of persons can be persuaded to part with cash to procure something of more immediate value. To take the thesis that the author deserves royalty because he worked on the book is of a piece with the copy-book morality of another day that taught that prosperity was sure to follow from early rising.

A sliding scale of royalties does not run across editions. When a new edition is prepared and offered for sale, the bottom of the scale again applies. The slide is not cumulative for edition after edition, but applies successively to each edition. The reason for this is the complement of the reason that makes the slide equitable. With a new edition, the publisher's unit cost of manufacture sharply increases; it may indeed be greater for a second or subsequent edition than for the original, for it is sometimes more costly to remake a book than to make it in the first place.

But let us here make sure what a "new edition" is, for this is another of those chameleons of publishing verbiage. When 2000 copies of a book are printed initially it is common practice to speak of an edition of 2000. Yet if a second run of 2000 copies is made without change of type, this is not properly speaking a second edition. To save nervous wear and tear, it should always be referred to as a second *printing* and the original printing should also be referred to as a printing. Nor is a new edition constituted when minor changes—typographical correction and matters of like sort—are made in a second

or subsequent printing. It is a new *edition* only when changes so substantial are made that the old form is rendered, in important particulars, out of date.

Opportunity lurks here for a twilight zone between "minor changes" and "substantial changes." Stalwart publishers will not permit a twilight zone. The new run must be either distinctly a new edition or distinctly not a new edition. If the author insists on going so far in changes that any doubt arises, then he must be obliged—if necessary, at the point of a gun—to go far enough to dissipate the doubt.

Not that doubtful "new editions" have never been perpetrated. Unfortunately they have, perhaps because publishers are occasionally frail. And some of them are downright mean: they have the author add a chapter of doubtful value or a few more bibliographic notes, merely (it would seem) for the sake of announcing a "new edition." It isn't playing quite fair.

Of course we do not allude here to new editions of classic books. Here *edition* means no more than a new typographical dress—the wording is precisely the same. Nor do we speak of reprint editions made from the original plates but in a cheaper dress. There is probably no way of freeing the word *edition* from its traditional looseness. But it can be borne in mind that it does have a particular meaning in contradistinction to a reprinting.

No publisher has yet attained perfect proficiency in the art of guessing the right number of copies to print, so publishing contracts include remainder

clauses. These occasionally cause some wonderment on the part of authors, for they read that, after a proper interval, the publisher may sell the book at half or less than half the original list, and pay the author no royalty. It looks like a little more of Barabbas's fancywork, for on the surface the publisher receives something but the author nothing. The rationale is that remaindering is purely a salvage operation. When the publisher resorts to it, he has given up all hope of profit on the remaining copies, at least, and usually on the book as a whole. In brief, he is selling at a direct loss. He is handling some dollars and cents but he is getting not only nothing but less than nothing; the author is at least not in that predicament. In most remaindering, the publisher does not recover even his unit cost of manufacture, to say nothing whatever of other costs. The remainder clause is an entirely fair prophylactic.

Contracts usually specify that the author is to receive a number of copies, usually ten, on publication, without charge. These are for personal use, to present to friends, to possess for mementoes, or to pay obligations incurred in gathering material for the book. A demand for an exceptional number of free copies is unwise for both publisher and author. They are not produced without cost, and this cost, like every other, must be recovered in list price. Moreover an exceptional distribution by the author may readily operate to reduce sales, to say nothing of tending to destroy the value of the book as a desirable one to purchase.

The author is also privileged to buy copies of his own book at a discount. The privilege does not extend to his publisher's entire list. The discount may be relatively low or relatively high. In the former case, the publisher is probably including sales to author in the books royalty is paid on, so the author gets another cut. In the latter, he is definitely excluding them. Hasty judgment of the publisher's liberality based on this factor is therefore ill-advised.

It is an impropriety for the author either to sell books acquired at the privilege discount or to make use of his privilege to purchase copies for friends. The practice indeed may be more than an impropriety: the author has conveyed the *sole* right to sell to the publisher, and he can't "take back" without special understanding and arrangement.

Royalties are accumulated and paid, as a rule, twice a year, when the publisher reports to the author the number of copies sold in the interval since the last report, or the amount received for sales, and sends the author a check in accord.

III. *The Author as Collaborative Publisher*

EVERY book published is of necessity a collaboration between author and publisher. But sometimes the author comes in actually as co-publisher because he makes some contribution to the cost of publishing.

If he contributes so much as to bear the entire cost of publishing and pay the alleged publisher a profit besides, the phenomenon of "vanity publishing" is observed, so called because the author is presumed to be engaged chiefly in erecting a monument to his ego. It might bear the name for other reasons. That which is vain is empty, and the literature thus published is likely to be pretty sterile. This is not to say that an author may not lawfully elect to publish his own work; in that case however it will bear his imprint—and no other—as publisher. But let vanity publishing be dismissed from mind with this passing mention. The discussion which follows has nothing to do with it.

There are many good reasons for co-publishing. The author may prefer it for purely economic reasons—he hazards his money as well as his brain-child because he believes in the latter and desires the larger

benefits that he believes he will ultimately derive from his having a finger in the publishing pie. Or it may be a case in which the publisher's judgment leads him to suppose that not enough copies of a book can be sold to justify commercial publication; the author may disagree with this conclusion and be able and willing to share in publication costs to prove his point. In such case, the publisher, though unwilling to make the whole gamble, may be willing to accept a part of it.

Or it may be one of those numerous manuscripts that ought to be published but of which no one has any illusions about sales possibilities. Occasionally a publisher will undertake such a book as a contribution to printed literature. He cannot do it often and stay in business, without pricing his other books to make an unconscionable profit on them. But the author may be willing to contribute as co-publisher.

No reputable publisher will undertake a project *merely* because the author contributes. This is not so much because of any rush of honor and ethics to the head (though honorable and ethical publishers are known to exist) as it is good business sense. First, the publisher invariably makes *some* contribution, takes some hazard. Second, even if the matter may be so fudged as to relieve the publisher of any hazard whatsoever, the publisher's reputation is his chief stock in trade. He simply can't afford to sacrifice it for the few dollars he might gain by publishing a worthless book.

Co-publishing agreements may be of infinite variety to accord with infinite variety of circumstances. There is, however, a pattern that has been followed in many cases that seems to be generally satisfactory, adequate, and equitable. The author makes his contribution by advancing the cost of manufacture of the book, or this cost plus a stipulated sum to be expended on direct advertising of the book. This pattern has one striking advantage: it leaves no doubt as to who owns the books printed, as physical entities; they belong wholly to the author.

Under an agreement of this type, the author is at liberty to determine the number of copies to be printed and, within reasonable limits, the list price. He may elect to have type kept standing with a view to further printings, and if he so elects, he bears the cost of type rental and storage. Since the copies belong to him, he may withdraw as many as he pleases at any time, with no cost other than for transportation and handling. But of course he may not draw copies for resale (unless that is part of the agreement), for he conveys to the publisher the exclusive right of sale. Nor should the number of copies distributed free by the author be so great as to interfere with the publisher's right of sale.

When the author pays the cost of manufacture, the confusion between "printing" and "publishing" may give him the impression that he is paying the whole cost of publication. This is not the case, since manufacture represents only a minor fraction of

the cost. The publisher contributes his organization and the complex of services required to distribute a book. In cost, these approximately equal what is paid for manufacturing and royalty. Thus when the author not only writes the book but furnishes the publisher with printed copies, he is bearing one-half of the whole cost of publication, while the publisher bears the other half.

Under such division, the author is entitled to and receives a royalty of one-half the total amount received for sales. This provides the customary royalty, a refund of the money the author has advanced for manufacture, and something in addition, if all goes well. If the book is correctly priced, and all copies printed are sold, the author will receive substantially more than his advance.

If, in addition to an advance for manufacture, the author also advances sums for direct advertising, the royalty is adjusted to compensate for the larger advance.

IV. *The Separate Functions of Author and Publisher*

THAT there should be some lack of clear definition between publishing and printing is not surprising. Almost anyone, confronted with the thesis for the first time, would promptly agree that such confusion was possible and merely seek enlightenment as to precisely what the difference might be.

An assertion that will not go down nearly as easily is that there is similar confusion between the separate functions of author and publisher, or author and printer. Evidence of such confusion actually exists, incredible as it may seem. It shows itself in both a negative and a positive aspect.

The author sometimes expects the publisher to do part of the authoring, complete the manuscript. Not yet is there on record an author who, at a point in his manuscript, writes a note to the publisher to say "Insert here two or three paragraphs on the parasites of the house-fly." But the author, by implication at least, sometimes expects of the publisher entirely analogous bits of authoring. To illustrate:

1. An author may quote from an existing work

or borrow an illustration from one and assume that the publisher will procure permission for the borrowing and dig up usable copy. In the case of an illustration, this is sometimes difficult. The copy as printed is not suitable; an original must be found; failing that, perhaps electros can be procured. Now a publisher will sometimes accommodate, and there is no reason why he shouldn't, if he wishes to. But when he does so, he is engaged in authoring not publishing. He properly pays the cost of electros in such cases, but all permissions are the author's responsibility.

2. An author may include with his manuscript illustrations clipped from other books, from magazines, or even from newspapers. This is no more than an indication of what he wishes—it is not copy. Maybe a publisher will set out with the indication and try to procure copy. Maybe, for that matter, a publisher will some day sit down and write two or three paragraphs on the house-fly. But when he does it, he is authoring, not publishing.

3. An author may submit a manuscript that he knows is full of typographical mischances and similar imperfections, or that is every-which-way from the viewpoint of orderly arrangement, with the expectation that the publisher will "take care of all that", even including verification of dates and references and correction of faulty construction. And so the publisher will—for a price; i.e., he will employ a silent co-author to complete the job of authoring.

4. An author occasionally expresses surprise when

he is called upon to furnish copy for an index. He had supposed the publisher would prepare the index. And so he will—again, for a price.

This is quite enough to show that confusion does exist, sometimes, as to the line of demarcation between authoring and publishing. The positive aspect of the same confusion is shown when the author inserts directions as to typography—i.e., the author sets himself up as a designer of printing. He may be the same author who doesn't furnish a complete manuscript, and rather a fine mess emerges with the publisher trying to complete the manuscript, and the author trying to direct the compositors. Virtually always the endeavor to be typographer fails, for the author usually knows little or nothing about what is possible in machine composition—indeed the more he knows, the less he hones to be typographer.

Sometimes the author wishes to be publisher. The particular function he likes best is advertising and announcement. His promotion plans may have much merit; but frequently they are costly beyond any possible hope of recovery in sales.

Obviously, author-publisher relations will be infinitely improved when publishers refrain from getting their fingers into the author's pie—and some publishers itch, apparently, to do the authoring—and when authors complete their own jobs and leave publishing and printing alone.

This is not, of course, to say that the publisher may not discuss the content and structure of a book

with the author, and make suggestions with reference thereto; or that an author may not declare some desired objective in typography that may have a distinct bearing on his presentation; or that an author may not have invaluable suggestions with respect to his book's promotion.

It does say that the several functions are distinct in fact and may be distinguished by intelligent minds. It does say that a situation that can be readily kept clear has been too much muddled by failure to observe the distinctness of function.

V. *The Author's Manuscript*

PITCHING headlong, as we now are, into a delicate subject, it is well to preface our venture with the statement that what is presently to be set forth is not written in the interest of making life happier for the publisher or printer. The happiness of the publisher is no concern of the author; but his own peace of mind is.

The bald fact is that nine-tenths of all the worriment and occasional disaster that goes with seeing a book through press is traceable to badly prepared copy. It is true that printer and publisher have to take some of the ensuing suffering; but most of it is borne by the author, owing to the nature of the case. Not infrequently, it costs him hard cash, in addition.

No author sends in bad copy with malice in his heart. Bad copy often, apparently, derives from the author's tacit assumption that by hook or crook, hocus or pocus, the publisher's reader, or the compositor, or the proof-reader, or someone, will pull the manuscript into shape wherever necessary, the author having given a sufficient indication of what he wishes.

The publisher's reader may pick up a few mischances, but he will not edit unless he is paid a fee

for the service. The conditions of modern book manufacture make it impossible for the craftsmen who work on a book to do anything else than try to transcribe what is written—down to its smallest detail—into type. Nor is it desirable for the publisher's and printer's employees to assume an editorial function, even if leisure is given them to do it. They do not know, not being clairvoyant, what the author wants, unless he is exact and specific. Plenty of printers have come serious croppers by presuming to correct "obvious errors."

But not all bad copy derives from taking it for granted that somebody along the line will do something about it. Sometimes it comes from the author's simply not knowing the methods and limitations of machine composition; not knowing, in brief, what the printer has to have in the way of copy. (Sometimes, also, it derives from the little knowledge that is a dangerous thing.) These lines are written for those who would learn the not-too-much that it is helpful for them to know. Not always can the "why" of a given stipulation be recited in full. It is often too long and involved a story. One can be reasonably sure that the publisher doesn't demand things of a manuscript just to sate the whims of his Aunt Hannah's Cousin Maud. If, for instance, he says "For God's sake, mister, don't try to get a book through piecemeal; give us your copy complete at one time," a bland and innocent "why?" adds nothing to the peace and content of his years. The answer to this one is that it has been tried over and over

again (and doubtless will be some more) and it always brings on a severe pain in the neck for everybody.

According to the lyrics of a book-publishing agreement, the author undertakes to furnish a manuscript "in a form suitable for composition into type". This may mean that the copy is to be cleanly typed on white paper, and nothing more; it may indeed mean almost anything. But since the publisher, typically, is the maker of the phrase, it is pertinent to ask what *he* means by it.

Manuscripts are occasionally submitted that prove on inspection to be no more than the data from which a manuscript might be built; obviously this is not in "form suitable," no matter how cleanly typed. Manuscripts are also submitted that are part way between this condition and completed manuscript. The birth of a manuscript indeed is like the birth of a baby in that it doesn't come into existence in an instant, full panoplied; there is a period of parturition. Doubtless authors, like mothers, get weary of the game; but whereas the mother has to wait it out, the author sometimes sends his product, as thus far developed, to a publisher. Thus it happens that manuscripts appear in all stages of fetal growth.

The publisher (to pursue the figure to the bitter end) is an obstetrician, but no embryologist. At least he so hopes. In the absence of agreement to the contrary, he assumes (obviously excepting manuscripts sent in incomplete for a look-see) that:

a. The copy is all there, including fair copy for

preliminary pages and for illustrations from which line-cuts or half-tone engravings may be made;

b. The copy is in ordered array;

c. The style, the spelling, the punctuation, the capitalization is all precisely as the author and reader expect to see them in print, according to the canons of English usage;

d. Inconsistencies have been ironed out; it doesn't read "Gone With the Wind" in one place and *Gone With the Wind* in another; or Penna. in one place and Pa. in another; or harbour in one place and harbor in another;

e. The manuscript contains nothing libelous and is the author's own work; or, if he has borrowed illustrations or quoted the work of others, that he is in possession of written permission from the copyright-owners of the material borrowed or quoted.

Form suitable will not in itself guarantee acceptance of a manuscript; nor will its lack (if it is not too utterly lacking) make certain the rejection of an otherwise much desired manuscript. There is a vast middle ground, however, in which form suitable may be the decisive factor; and it will at least guarantee that a manuscript will be looked at.

Perhaps many manuscripts are submitted in form *not* suitable because the author has the persuasion that form suitable is a very simple and easy accomplishment, readily within the range of a child or a typist. Ask the author who has actually put his manuscript in form suitable, and you will get the information (sometimes regrettably interlarded with

profanity) that it is a difficult and trying piece of work that takes all the alertness and vigilance the author can command.

By what steps an author builds up his manuscript is quite his own affair, and doubtless there are as many procedures as there are authors. But some time he will approach final copy—he will have, let us say, a semi-final draft. He will probably do a great many things to this semi-final draft; and among them he should give close attention to spelling, punctuation, headings, consistencies of use, checking of references, and so forward. To procure consistency, it is almost essential to determine which of two or more possible styles is desired and make a list of the desired ones for constant reference—one does forget.

Now also should come a special and particular scrutiny, unhampered by any consideration except one. It is conceded that few authors, even of the noblest, do this particular editorial job. Wherefore we edge up on discussion of it with due solemnity, bated breath, and other evidences of being engaged in the extremely momentous.

The manuscript should be carefully read with an eye to casting out the verbal bums—idle words that are doing no one any good. Their up-keep in composition and presswork is presently to be precisely the same as that of working words. Once in type, it costs more to take them out than to leave them in. So take them out now.

As we speak—any of us—and as we write casually,

we use many more words than are required, even when we have something to say, and are saying it and no more, even when we have already shorn our story of its unnecessary details. These idle words add nothing to clarity, nothing to emphasis. They may—though not invariably—detract from both. At best, they are as meaningless as so much white space in the line; at worst, they befog the reader and actually distort his interpretation.

“The question as to whether or not” means “The question whether.” “For the simple reason that” means “because.” “Everyone is familiar with the fact that” means “Everyone knows.” “This is the reason for the fact that” means “This is why.” These are merely common examples. It is quite impossible to suggest otiosities typical of every possible otiosity.

Do such idle words really come to mean something important? They do indeed. If they were eliminated from the literature of the day, several hundred miles of stock-room shelving in libraries would be vacant. An earnest book-buyer would save several hundred dollars in the course of a life-time. Days and weeks of time would be spared to an inveterate reader. It is no pindling matter of an extra word here and there we speak of. By repeated test, idle words run from ten to thirty per cent of the total number of words in a manuscript—unless elimination has been practiced or the author is singularly blessed with a very compact style. It is certainly no exag-

generation to assert that at least fifteen per cent of the words in print, this year of grace, are idle.

Consider the foregoing paragraph; it is not noticeably verbose; it has not been deliberately stuffed. But observe the ossia:

Do idle words really mean something important? They do. If they were eliminated, several hundred miles of shelving in libraries would be vacant. An earnest book-buyer would save several hundred dollars in a life-time. Weeks of time would be spared to an inveterate reader. It is no pindling matter of an extra word here and there. By repeated test, ten to thirty per cent of the words in a manuscript are idle—unless they have been cast out, or the author is singularly blessed with a compact style. At least fifteen per cent of the words now in print are idle.

VI. *Fair Copy*

WHAT does "fair copy" mean? In what sense is *fair* used? Beautiful, as in "fair lady"? Something short of good, as employed in marking an examination paper? Or is it—something like a fair ball—merely copy that gives the typesetter at least a sporting chance to transmute it into type?

Take your choice; nearly everyone else does. Anyhow, we are down to final copy, as the author plans to transmit it to the printer. All the re-shuffling and re-arranging has been done; the scratching-in and scratching-out completed; spelling, dates, numerals, punctuation, references, consistencies, all checked and double-checked. There remains the task of making the manuscript ready for press. It is not very difficult to see why, at this point, the author is fed up; why he is tempted to submit it as it stands. There are, to be sure, professionals who will prepare manuscript for press, if you can find one when you want one. Indeed the printer will do it. Either one will make a charge to the author for the service. It cannot be done, incidentally so to speak, by the typesetter as the job is being composed; it is a distinct and separate operation.

Even a wealthy author, if there is one, will be well

advised if he thinks twice before taking this way out. In the first place, he will have to furnish his stooge with some pretty-well-detailed instructions, in writing. He will also, being prudent, have a look at the final copy after it is prepared and before it goes to the compositor, to certify that what he has directed has been done, for the misinterpretation of instructions is by no means unheard of. This means a word-for-word scrutiny and doubtless further correction. Finally, the editor is one probably not acquainted with all the technicalities of the subject and he is consequently not in as good a position to redact as the author is. Tough as it is, the author would better keep the final copy directly in his own hands.

Final copy should be typewritten, double (or triple) spaced, on $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 white paper. Have two carbon copies made. Send the original and one carbon to the publisher and retain the other carbon. There is reason in this madness. Bear in mind that the publisher does not guarantee either safe receipt or safe keeping of the manuscript, though as a matter of fact the loss of a manuscript by the publisher is a very remote possibility. For all that, it is extraordinarily unwise to commit a unique copy to the publisher, if it can possibly be avoided.

The printer will take the original to work from; when "in process", the manuscript loses its integrity, being broken into "takes" of several sorts. So an extra complete copy in the publisher's hands, if not an absolute necessity, is very desirable. His sales

staff, as an example, can make the book's acquaintance. Since you're doing it, therefore, take the added insurance and comfort that derives from two carbon copies. The original should be on paper of the customary weight; the carbons may be on a thinner paper.

Don't roll or fold the manuscript; send it flat. Don't staple the sheets, or any of them, together; use clips. Paginate from one up for the entire manuscript, in the upper right hand corner. Begin each chapter or section on a new page. It is convenient if the sheets for each chapter are clipped together, or the chapters separated from each other by placing each in a file-folder, but this is sometimes not possible.

Be careful about references: cross-references, references to bibliography, to footnotes, to tables and illustrations.

Cross-references cannot be finally inserted until page-proof is available. Type them "See page 000". Do not put in the page of the manuscript on the copy sent to the printer, though it is a sound idea to pencil them on your own copy for future guidance. If the manuscript-page is put in, the typesetter will transcribe it, and the chance of its remaining there—a maddening error, after the book is in type—is greater than if three zeros are used. The latter are a red flag to the proof-reader.

References to bibliography are by number, and are placed where desired within parentheses—typically, "(16)". References to footnotes, also by number,

are distinguished by being written as superior numerals—typically, “New York City³”. Indicate by “√”.

Do not refer to tables or illustrations in phrases including “the following”, “above”, “below”. It may be mechanically impossible to place the table or illustration to correspond. Refer always to “fig. 5”, “plate III”, “table 20”.

It is no part of the present purpose to set forth a style as to capitals, punctuation and emphasis. A good, sound, general rule is to be sparing in the use of all three. As to the capital, if there is any doubt, put it “down”. Use italic only when necessary. Italic used excessively for mere emphasis obviously defeats its own objective. Bold-face is something to be avoided altogether, except for certain specific purposes—as in a text-book, for instance. Whole phrases or sentences in capitals for emphasis only are quite beyond the pale. Get your emphasis from the way you say it, not from the way the printer prints it. Don’t use avoidable quotation marks. Watch your commas: in particular, see that a lone one doesn’t creep in between a subject and its verb. If the sense absolutely requires a succession of commas after successive single words, see if there isn’t something rotten about the construction of the sentence. Watch your dashes: a heavy fall of them in any one place indicates a pathologic condition. Don’t use exclamation points after declarative sentences.

Theoretically the final copy should be letter-perfect,

as typed. Of course it never is. Minor corrections have to be made. Make these between lines, carefully and neatly; or the margin may be used moderately, if there is not room between lines. Make all corrections horizontal with the typescript. When a page is much interlineated, it should be retyped. When an insertion or a substitution consists of several lines, they should be typed on a separate sheet, and scissors and paste-pot employed to bring the insertion into place (but don't employ "streamers"). Use paste, not pins. Pins may tear the copy, and it is too easy for a bit pinned on to separate from its mother and become an orphan.

There may even be a long addition of two or more full typewritten pages. The question is how to paginate these insertions. The advice to repaginate the entire manuscript from the point following the insert is a counsel of perfection: a thousand pages may be involved. The next best thing is to paginate the insert with the numeral on the page next preceding and add the letters of the alphabet in order, e.g., "21a . . . 21b". If this is done, be sure to indicate the final page of the insert in some unmistakable fashion, e.g., "21c no 21d to follow". Also, the final page of the manuscript should be indicated—"Last page", for instance.

The typography of a book is a matter for publisher and printer to determine, and the author can seldom be of any service in what is a purely technical matter with which he is usually unacquainted. The author is naturally interested in how his work is going to

look in type, but attempt on his part to write specifications too frequently results in stipulating the physically impossible or the ludicrous from the viewpoint of book-manufacture. Often also, of course, the difference is that between tweedledee and tweedledum; but in such cases, why should the author bother his head about it? He will have enough on his mind without that. The author, to be sure, may have some particular objective in mind that must be brought about typographically. He should state the objective to his publisher, and let publisher and printer work out the technical details. In brief, much conversation and what-not is spared if the author sticks to authoring, the publisher to publishing, and the printer to printing.

Nevertheless there are certain typographical indications to be given by the author. He shows, e.g., where he wants an initial capital letter. He indicates the use of italic by underscoring words to be set in italic. Two underscores indicate small capitals; three indicate capitals. A wavy line indicates bold-face.

Except for the italic, and the occasional use of three lines to bring up a lower-case letter improperly typed for a capital, the underscorings are of chief use in indicating headings and sub-headings. These are tricky things. Consistency should certainly be observed. It is a shock to pick up a manuscript that goes along for a chapter or two without a suspicion of a sub-heading, and then bounce into one that sprinkles them in every dozen lines or so. It is a

further shock to find sub-headings with no discoverable ordination.

Four gradations of sub-headings are usually sufficient, and each should be indicated always in the same distinctive way in the manuscript: (*a*) Chapter heading, in capital letters centered; (*b*) first sub-heading, in small caps, centered; (*c*) second sub-heading, in italic caps and lower-case, centered; (*d*) third sub-heading, italic not centered but run in at the beginning of a paragraph. Omit periods after centered headings. If the scheme of sub-headings is more complicated than this, it is wise to submit a chart for the printer's guidance, showing the gradations and stating how each is indicated in the manuscript.

A few other typographical indications are necessary to correct the typescript where it happens to indicate (typographically) something the author does not intend. Short quotations are placed in the usual quotation-marks. But a quotation of four lines or more is stripped of quotation-marks and printed in a smaller type-size. In manuscript this is best indicated by indenting both ends of the typewritten lines. Suppose the indentation has been overlooked. Indicate it by drawing a square opposite the line with which the quoted matter begins and drawing a vertical line from the square to the line at which the quotation stops. Do this on both sides of the text to be indented.

If lines have been unwittingly indented in typescript, indicate no indent by "□," which means that the line or lines are to be set flush.

If you want a numeral or an abbreviation spelled out, draw a circle around it.

If you want a capital letter to show in lower case, draw a diagonal line lightly through it from northeast to southwest.

If you want to strike out a word or a phrase, draw a heavy horizontal line through it. No delete mark (δ) is necessary. If the passage you wish to strike out is long, draw heavy lines through the first and last typewritten lines, and a heavy diagonal across the entire passage, from northeast to southwest. If an entire page is thus struck out, don't remove the page—it has to be in to keep the pagination straight.

If you want a new paragraph where the typescript has none, put “¶” before the word that is to begin the new paragraph. If you want no paragraph where the typescript has one, draw a curve connecting the last and first words of the paragraphs you wish to throw together, and write “no ¶” in the left margin.

If words are run together that should be spaced, draw a light vertical line at the point where space is to come.

It is sometimes difficult to certify from typescript whether a hyphen or a dash is desired. If there is doubt, indicate a hyphen by “=,” a dash by “ $\frac{1}{m}$.” If a hyphen shows at the end of a line of typescript and is not merely a sign of a divided word, certify the hyphen by “=.” Distinguish between comma and apostrophe, if there can be any doubt, by writing “^” for a comma, and “v” for an apostrophe. Draw a circle around doubtful periods—“ \odot .”

If you want to transpose words or phrases, draw a curve under the words that first appear and over those that appear last, crossing over at the point of transposition.

If you have crossed out words you later decide to keep in and the words crossed out are still legible, draw a line of dots under them. If they are not legible, rewrite them above. Substitutions are also written in above the words substituted for, the latter being struck out with a horizontal line.

The typesetter assumes that everything on the page is "copy." If therefore you write instructions to the printer in the margin, draw a circle around the instructions.

The printer will follow copy with almost (but not quite) absolute rigidity. That is, he will—perhaps automatically—correct what seems an open-and-shut case of obvious error, if he observes it, as he may or may not. There may be some such dubious passage in your manuscript which nevertheless you wish to have printed exactly as typed. It is wise in such cases to write in the margin "Follow copy exactly."

VII. *The Ends and the Oddments*

THE ends are, of course, the index at one end and the preliminary pages (prelims to you) at the other. The oddments are such things as footnotes, citations, running heads. Suppose we start with the prelims.

Some books go in for prelims in a big way. Possibly the subject is controversial and too hot to handle in comfort. Throwing discretion to the winds, this corner announces its conviction that the fewer prelims there are, the better. They are like the long preamble the speaker of the evening may indulge in before he gets down to what he has to say, while the suffering victim moans "why doesn't he get on with it?"

Sometimes, ahead of the title-page, a bastard title is placed—i.e., a page with nothing but the title thereon. This seems to be invariable in books of English origin. Similar all-but-blank pages are sometimes placed ahead of "parts" or even chapters, throughout the book. What purpose or significance they may have is inconceivable; nor do they add anything to the appearance of a book. Occasionally they help the printer to make up a form without too many blanks, but that is all. The idea may have had some value once, but certainly it should be decently

interred now. In any case, the author doesn't need to furnish copy for them, so they can be dismissed from further consideration here.

The author should furnish copy for his title-page, but omit the publisher's imprint; the publisher ought to do his own signing. Likewise the author need not furnish copy for the back-title; indeed he cannot. This too the publisher must assume responsibility for. The dedication, if there is one, follows the back-title. It is infrequently of a length greater than a single page, and its overleaf is usually left blank.

Next follows a preface or a foreword or both. The words are interchangeable synonyms, but *preface* is used generally to designate what the author himself has to say about his stuff, and *foreword* to designate what some sponsor has to say about the author. If a book has both preface and foreword, the foreword should logically precede. *Introduction* is best confined to the designation of material that leads into the subject itself.

There isn't much an author can do about a foreword, if he has asked a friend to contribute one, but take it as it stands, whatever it says. There is a lot he can do about a preface. It needs to be brief but pointed. Remember it's the first smell of the book that the prospective reader and purchaser is likely to get; and first impressions are important. Probably it exaggerates to say that a preface can make or break a book, but it can certainly help or hinder its distribution.

The preface should cleverly and unobtrusively invite the reader to buy the book—or at least to read it. It should indicate the book's *raison d'être*. It cannot describe the book in full, but it can and should point to its high spots, show why it differs from other books, justify the book in brief, and with all this it must be short. As a tail-on, the preface will make the necessary acknowledgments.

Some prefaces manage all this very nicely. Some are merely colorless, and represent lost opportunity. Some are definitely detrimental, the chief reason being that the author spills over with apology. Modesty is a virtue, and the author need not go heavily into the business of self-praise in his preface. But the other extreme is quite as bad. In this, he not only apologizes for speaking in public at all but tells all the things the book isn't and winds up by describing its shortcomings in detail. If the book is really as poor as the author makes it out to be, then truly there is no reason for reading it or paying any further attention to it. It seems reasonable to say that the modesty displayed is false in such cases, for obviously the author does not expect to be taken at his word; and false modesty is no virtue.

The preface is followed by the table of contents which always begins on a right-hand page. Copy for the table of contents may consist of no more than the chapter headings or, subordinate to these, every sub-heading may be given, or every subject, or both. The copy should give the page numbers of the manu-

script, even though these numbers will be disregarded in setting into type. They are of assistance in the examination of the manuscript.

A detailed table of contents is desirable (but not essential) for the same reason. It helps to tell what the manuscript is about and where certain discussions may be found; there is no index of the manuscript at this time. But there is no observable point in actually transcribing this detailed table into print, even though it is often, indeed quite regularly done, and the table goes on and on for interminable page after interminable page. It is a sheer waste of paper and money, unless this is the only index the book is to have. Common as the detailed table of contents is, it will not stand logical scrutiny. To include it means the absurdity of an alphabetic index at one end of the book and a page-order index at the other. No one would dream of including a page-order index, in addition to the alphabetic, at the back of the book, and it is no more reasonable at the front. There may be highly exceptional circumstances which demand a detailed table of contents, but except for that possibility a list of chapter-headings is sufficient. If however a detailed table of contents is actually printed, it must agree exactly with the text.

Much the same may be said of a list of illustrations. The list should accompany the manuscript, as an inventory of the illustrative copy sent to the publisher, to give him the order of them and enable him to certify that all are present. But a printed list of

illustrations is a futile waste of the purchaser's money. This goes double for a list of tables; such a list occasionally appears, to clutter up the prelims still further.

The practice of detailing the contents and listing illustrations is probably followed blindly. It is merely observed that other books of like sort have these things, and thus a practice that has no genuine value is perpetuated.

Copy for prelims should accompany the manuscript. If for any reason preface or dedication or foreword cannot be furnished at that time, put in a sheet on which is written what is to come and its approximate length; e.g., "Foreword to come: about 500 words."

Footnotes appear to be sometimes regarded as marks of distinction and scholarship. They are thoroughly undesirable brats, though occasionally unavoidable. Where they are descriptive, the material would better be incorporated in the text. If the author desires to annotate his chapter severally and frequently, it is better to place the annotations at the end of the chapter or of the book. Citations of literature and sources are also best placed either at the end of the chapter or at the end of the book, and referred to from the text by number.

Number footnotes, if inescapable, from one up for each chapter. Type footnotes on sheets separate from the text and paginate these sheets in regular numerical order at the end of the chapter they are to

be sprinkled about in. Check to see that there is a reference for every footnote and a footnote for every reference. Do not use asterisks, daggers, and other what-not for reference-marks.

It is conventional (at present) to decorate each page, at the top, with what is called a running head. Usually the title of the book appears on the left-hand page and the title of the chapter on the right-hand page, but there is no fixed rule. Titles are frequently too long to go into a single line, and the author should furnish copy for the running heads. This is done by condensing the titles, as the author wishes them condensed. Each should be typed on a separate sheet and placed ahead of the chapter to which it belongs. That for the entire book should be placed ahead of the first chapter of text.

If tables are included in the copy, they should be numbered from one up for the entire book and invariably referred to by number, in the text.

Citations of literature should be segregated after each chapter or all together after the final chapter, under the heading "References" or "Bibliography." They should be typed on separate sheets, not mixed up with text. They should be numbered consecutively in any logical order the author chooses. Sometimes alphabetic order is selected, especially if there is to be but one bibliography for the entire book, when it serves very well as an author-index of sorts. But the order of appearance of the references in the text is also logical, and is most commonly used for lists by chapter, periodical articles, and indeed any

short list of no more than a couple of pages. Checking references to bibliography is one of the last-minute jobs in the preparation of final copy.

A uniform style should be maintained in writing citations. Titles of chapters or periodical articles should be placed within quotation marks; names of books and periodicals should be italicized. Likewise maintain a uniform sequence. A good sequence is author, title of article or chapter, name of periodical or book, date (year), volume number (if necessary, as in citations from periodicals), page numbers. But this sequence may be varied, of course.

Bibliographies seem to be especially prone to error. They should therefore be rigidly checked, not forgetting to certify the correctness of spelling of the names of authors and of publications.

Nearly every book on a scientific or technical subject requires an index. It is hopeless to attempt to make this from manuscript or galley-proof. There are such things as professional indexers, but it is the author's duty to furnish this copy, just as he furnishes any other copy for his book, and the index is usually best made by him or under his direct supervision.

An index may be quite simple. It may also be complicated. In the latter case, the form should be carefully planned. If typographical complications seem likely, it is prudent to ask the printer's and publisher's counsel. Once the plan is made, it is not too difficult to prepare good index copy.

Work from page-proof. Make the entries on 3 x 5 white cards, procurable at any stationer's. Write on

one side of the card only, and write as legibly as possible, even if it takes a little longer. For if these cards are legible, they will serve very well as copy; the entries need not be transcribed to typewritten sheets. Having completed the entries on the cards, arrange them in alphabetic order.

This is most easily done by successive steps. Because each group of three letters is readily associated, break the cards into eight piles—ABC, DEF, etc., the last pile being VWXYZ. Then take each pile in order, and divide into three piles. Then take the A pile and arrange that in alphabetic order, according to the second letter—and so on and on far into the night.

You may encounter several entries of the same word, with differing sub-words: e.g., "Skin—chemical changes"; "Skin—dermatoses" and so forward. The sub-words are arranged alphabetically under the main word; and if one goes so far, sub-sub-words are likewise so arranged under sub-words.

How far an index should go into detail is as much a matter for the author's judgment as how far he shall go in the discussion of a subject. But an excellent guide is to keep in mind what an index is for. Its purpose is to help a reader to find what he is likely to wish to find. That entry should be selected which the reader is most likely to look for. If there is doubt, cross-reference will usually resolve it. Put no minutiae in the index that no reader is likely to look for. It is an index, not a concordance, that is being prepared.

Whether there should be an author-index in addition to or combined with the subject-index is a question that may be referred to the same criterion—is the reader likely to find it necessary? To have an author-index merely for the sake of appearances is plain wasteful.

VIII. *Illustrations*

WHEN illustrations are necessary to a manuscript, it is the author's business to furnish fair copy. The instruction to copy so-and-so from such-and-such is distinctly unfair copy. It is the author's job to get the permissions and also to give copy from which proper reproduction can be made. A decent job cannot result from making a half-tone of a half-tone already printed in an existing book, to say nothing of a half-tone printed in a newspaper. The author furnishes the copy; the publisher pays for the engravings.

Illustrative material is chiefly of two sorts: black and white drawings, reproduced by the line-engraving process; and photographs, wash drawings, or anything that includes shading, reproduced by the half-tone process.

Line-engravings are virtually always designated as text figures. Draw them with India ink, preferably on white paper or cloth. If coördinate ruled paper is used, be sure to use a blue-lined paper; all other colors blur on reproduction, but the blue lines do not show at all.

Lettering should be plain and large enough to be legible when the drawing is reduced in reproduction. Coördinate lettering should be done on the

chart itself; gummed letters are easily lost. Care should be taken not to waste space, as this usually means a less satisfactory illustration. It is often possible to plot two or more curves on one graph; this not only saves cost, but makes for reader-ease in making comparisons.

In making drawings it is well to keep constantly in mind that the engraver can make the reproduction (within limits) any size he pleases, but that he cannot alter the proportions, nor put something in that is not in the copy. It is good practice therefore to make all drawings in a book conform to a single scale, so far as possible, so that the reductions will also be uniform. Usually drawings are drawn relatively large; usually therefore they are reduced. The size, character, and number of the illustrations are factors in the design of the book as a whole. If the drawings have no uniformity of scale, it almost certainly follows that the reproductions will be out of focus, so to speak.

Keep also in mind that a given percentage of reduction in dimension means a much larger percentage of reduction in area. If you tell the engraver to "reduce one-third", he will take one-third off each dimension. Thus a $3 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ illustration reduces to 2×3 ; the area, from $13\frac{1}{2}$ square inches to 6.

Half-tones are, like line engravings, designated as text figures when they occupy less than a full page. When they do occupy a full page, and particularly when they represent something of especial importance, they are often designated as plates. Some-

times several half-tones are grouped to make a full-page plate.

No illustration should be rolled or folded, as for mailing. They should be mailed flat, well-protected from bending and torn edges. Photographs should, if possible, be glossy prints; these reproduce better than do rough or dull-surface prints.

One important thing to remember about a photograph is that it is of soft material, and that every mark on it will be reproduced by the engraver. Under no circumstances should paper clips be used on a photograph. You will have to write some identifying mark on the back of it, but do this as lightly as possible with a very soft pencil or crayon; and be sure that the surface you lay it face down upon when you are marking it is hard and smooth, like glass. There is always the hazard that pressure put on the back will appear as a blemish on the front surface.

You may wish to use only a part of a photograph. To indicate this, take a piece of thin paper as large as the entire photograph, lay it over the photograph, and very lightly trace thereon the outlines of the portion you wish to reproduce. Cut out the area within the outline. Mark on the remaining white area (but not while it is resting on the photograph) "Crop as indicated." Then paste the edge of the paper to the back top edge of the photograph and fold the sheet over the photograph, like a veil.

Legends for illustrations (unless they are an integral part of the illustration-copy itself) should be

typed on separate sheets. They should not be cut apart and pasted to the illustrations, either as "streamers" or flat on the back—above all, not pasted flat on the back. Observe what occurs:

The author or his typist has gone to the trouble of typing the legends, cutting them apart, and pasting them on the illustrations. But the illustrations go to the engraver; the legends, to the typesetter. So the printer must now get them off as best he can and paste them on sheets again or copy them—and there may be a thousand of them. This is decidedly unfair copy, and the printer will doubtless ask the author for fair copy for his legends.

But you must identify the illustrations somehow. With the aforesaid very soft pencil, put the chapter-number and the figure- or plate-number on the back, i.e., "Cap V #32" or "Plate VIII." If there is the slightest reason to suspect doubt about it, write also "Top" along the appropriate edge.

Number all figures—line-engraving and half-tone—in Arabic numerals from one up for the entire book, in the order of their appearance in the book. Number plates in Roman numerals from one up for the entire book. See that there is an illustration for every legend and a legend for every illustration—or at least a legend-reference in the list of legends you furnish the printer. Say, for instance, "Fig. 8 (no legend)" or "Fig. 8 (legend incorporated in graph)." This certifies that you haven't merely forgot to furnish a legend for the legendless figure. When several half-tones are grouped in a full-page plate, each

component is given a figure-number (from one up for each plate) within the plate.

Legends are sometimes called captions. Speaking more exactly, a caption is a heading, while a legend is written underneath or at the side of a picture. Rarely, a style of illustration calls for both captions and legends.

IX. *Proof-Reading and Reading Proof*

AS A contribution toward a more exact speech, let us draw a sharp distinction between proof-reading and reading proof. They are, in fact, quite different operations, require a different approach and a different technique, and have a different objective.

It is superficially assumed that the bright young men and women employed as proof-readers in a printing establishment and the author do exactly the same thing to proof. The query may then logically arise whether this is not wasteful duplication of effort. The answer doubtless will be that in catching errors two policemen are better than one, but it's a rather lame answer.

The fact is the proof-reader, particularly in scientific and technical publications, cannot read proof. Nor is the author likely to be a trained proof-reader; why then should he proof-read? He has enough to do, goodness knows, in just reading proof. Proof-reading by him may be not only futile, but detrimental. It is tedious work and if he does it he may scamp his real job; if he concentrates on the latter, the end result of the process of proof-reading and

reading proof is infinitely more likely to be better.

Proof-reading is for the detection of errors in the transcription of manuscript to type. The practice of reading proof probably originated in the early days when printers, like as not, played monkey-shines with the copy; if the printer didn't like the way the guy said it, he changed it. So authors naturally demanded proof. Today printers know their place and follow the copy as they understand the copy. They may misinterpret however, so reading proof is still a good idea. Reading proof is also for the detection of errors in fact, punctuation, spelling, construction, consistency, and all matters of like sort.

It is impossible to carry forward both operations at one time. One may proof-read the entire text and then read proof of it, or one may alternate in short bits such as paragraphs; but always there are two distinct mental operations. One who is proof-reading may casually and incidentally pick up an error not of transcription. Also, one who is reading proof may discover an error of transcription. But this does not disturb the main thesis.

Proof-reading is done by the printer. Its techniques need not be described here, but they are highly special, and a good proof-reader is several years in the making. Let it be reiterated that the prime responsibility of the printer is to transcribe exactly. If the proof-reader chances to encounter a misspelled word, he will correct it; if he encounters something

that looks as if the author had erred, he will put a technical query (Qy) in the margin, directing the authors particular attention to the spot. But these are courtesies.

When the author receives galley-proof, the material has already been proof-read and corrected at least once and often twice. How should he go about reading proof? The essence of proof-reading is comparison with the manuscript. That is not the essence of reading proof. The author knows his subject and he knows his manuscript; of course not word for word, but it is at hand for reference if necessary. He may rely upon it that no entire blocks of manuscript are missing from the transcription. So he reads, as he would read something encountered for the first time, for sense, with an eye to slips in statement of fact, to faulty construction, or orthography, or other mischances of like nature.

When he encounters what he does not believe he could have written, he refers to the manuscript. If the error is indeed one of transcription, he marks the correction in ink of a distinctive color. If he does not, the correction will be unfairly charged as an author's alteration. He may not, in honor, take for granted that a particularly lousy bit or a childish error in spelling derives from the printer's ignorance and mark it as an error in transcription, without reference to the manuscript.

He will encounter proof-readers' queries—e.g., "Qy? Author: Is this correct?" He should answer

all queries. If he does not, the passage will stand. If he accepts the query, the resulting correction is an author's alteration.

He will probably encounter parts that must be changed. He will also encounter parts which, now that he reflects, might have been better stated in another way. And here is temptation to go wrong—i.e., to rewrite the book, or large portions of it, after it is in type.

Mind you, the printer does not object to this. Why should he? It represents so much volume of business, acquired without sales effort or expenditure and without competition. The printer will complain only if the author sends back "dirty" proof and expects it to be handled without taking a corresponding additional time.

The point is that author's alterations are charged to the author, beyond a certain cost—usually ten per cent of the cost of original composition—stipulated in his contract with the publisher. It is utterly erroneous for the author to assume that he can safely alter ten per cent of all the words in his manuscript and stay within his limit. His galley-proof represents more than the cost of original composition—e.g., it represents also the cost of proof-reading and correcting and the cost of pulling proofs. Moreover it costs more to substitute a word than to set the word in the first place. In short the author is well-advised to alter only what it is positively necessary to alter, and to think thrice before he decides that it is necessary—unless money means nothing to him.

The place to do the rewriting is in the final going-over of the manuscript. There emendation costs no more than the bother to make the corrections. The same bother is entailed in the stage of galley-proof—plus the employment of one or more craftsmen at good wages.

The author need not worry about certain extraneous and cryptic lines of type at the tops of galleys or in the margin. They are the printer's own guides. The author disregards them. If he cuts them off or obliterates them, the printer loses the location of the page or galley on his racks. Proofs should never be cut up, for any reason.

In marking corrections, use the standard proof-reader's marks. By long custom, their meaning is fully established. Use of some other system may readily cause confusion. *Mark all corrections in the margin.* You may have interlined manuscript, but don't do it here. The corrector is likely to miss any correction not in the margin.

If you wish to insert more than will go in the margin, type the lines on a sheet of paper and paste it on the margin, indicating where the insert is to begin. Don't pin it; a sheet pinned on is easily detached and lost, and the pin may tear the proof.

Don't write comprehensive directions on the proof such as "change AB to BA wherever found." The result is procured by marking the change each time it occurs.

Don't try to correspond with the publisher or printer on the proof. The man who handles the

proof has nothing to do with business relationships with the author or the press-work or binding of the book.

If in some detail of typography the printer's preference proves to be not the same as yours—if, e.g., he has set the (a)'s and (b)'s in legends in italic whereas you would have preferred roman—, don't be so unreasonable as to ask him to change the detail throughout. Such details are within the publisher's province. The change cannot be made for the whole book by pulling a master-lever; each occurrence has to be minutely marked for correction and minutely corrected. The cost is out of all proportion to the result achieved.

If you wish to write instructions to the printer, place them in the margin of the proof and encircle them so they will not be mistaken for copy and incorporated in the text. If they are too long to write in the margin, write them on separate sheets and mail them separately. If you mail them with the proof, the whole parcel must go at first-class postage-rates.

Engraver's proofs of illustrations will come to you with galley-proof. Read proof of the illustrations as you do that of the text, to detect blemishes and to certify that the engraving is what you want. If the engraving is faulty or not according to your directions, it is an error of transcription and the publisher pays for a new plate. If the engraver has done the best one could be expected to do, but it isn't good enough and you decide to have a new plate

made from better copy, the cost is an author's alteration.

Indicate in the margin of the proof where each cut is to go, designating the illustration by number. The printer may not be able to get it in the exact spot you stipulate owing to the "break" of the pages, but he will come as close as possible. If any pair of illustrations must go on facing pages so that they show together when the book is open at that spot, tell the printer so. Likewise inform him of any figures that must go side by side.

Finally, mark on the proof of the engraving the word "Top", on the appropriate margin, to show how the illustration must appear on the page, unless there can be no question whatever; and remember that the make-up man may be perplexed when you can see no cause for doubt. If the proofs come to you with the word "Top" stamped on them, certify the correctness of the indication. If incorrect, change it.

When the author passes galley-proof, he assumes responsibility for any uncorrected errors, whether or not he has initialed each proof-sheet.

The next stage is page-proof. The primary purpose of reading page-proof is not to read the text itself, which is presumably fully correct, but to certify that the pages have been correctly and consecutively put together.

Certify that the changes ordered in galley-proof have been duly made. Pay particular attention to the things most easily overlooked. Read the title-

page carefully, the back-title and table of contents, seeing that the latter squares with the sequence in the book and that the wording of headings is precisely the same. Examine chapter headings and running heads. Check on the position of illustrations, and certify that legends and illustrations have been correctly matched. See that illustrations are right side up. Watch for inaccuracies in pagination. See that the carry of the text from page to page is correct. Answer all queries. If the preface has a date line, bring it up to date or delete it.

What about a final reading? Well, suppose we discuss that a bit. As an author sometimes assumes that publisher or printer will automatically correct "obvious errors", so he sometimes assumes that the publisher will give his book a final reading before it goes to press. This is by no means always the case, nor is it necessary. It is not the publisher's function—particularly in scientific and technical publications—to read proof critically.

The most critical, and most painstaking and scrupulous final reading should be done in the manuscript. The author who glides over that duty in the knowledge that he is going to have a couple more whacks before going to press is merely saving time and energy to be made up later by at least the same time and energy, plus the probability of very considerable cash cost. The later the stage at which the painstaking and scrupulous reading is done, the higher the probability of expense, and the greater the expense.

In favor of the author's giving page-proof a final

word-for-word reading is the obvious purpose of a last-minute check-up. There may be some brand-new report which makes it necessary to alter the text. The latter consideration is admittedly of first importance, but the author will be aware of the existence of the contingency without reading his book. In the absence of such new information, certain considerations weigh against a final reading.

If the author has done a proper job on the manuscript and again on galley-proof, there is little reason for a final going-over. Now if he reads critically again, he is all but certain to find passages here and there that he would now phrase differently, and the temptation to alter is all but irresistible. What he forgets is that preferences of this sort shift about. Six weeks after he reads page-proof, he may again prefer the way he had it in his manuscript. Nevertheless he feels at the moment as though life won't be worth living if the book goes to press as it stands. In brief, final reading in page-proof may lead directly into quite unnecessary author's alterations. The author may well consider whether he should subject himself to such a hazardous situation.

Perhaps a compromise is the best out. Let the author do his final reading on page-proof under solemn oath to himself not to emend in any way—not even so much as a comma—unless the text is ludicrous, unintelligible, or erroneous as it stands. The time has past for polishing; the zero hour has struck; the water is under the bridge. With that oath and with a resolute character to back it up, an

author may proceed to his reading of page-proof without the gnawing anxiety that his temerity is going to cost him a month's income.

For, mark you, alterations on page-proof can be unbelievably costly. On page 87 you may insert just enough material so that three or four lines are added to the page. That means a remake-up of every succeeding page until a blank space is encountered—as at the end of a chapter—to take up the added lines. The added lines may, indeed, require remake-up of every succeeding page in the book. Likewise if you take something out. Likewise if a rectangular illustration has somehow got into page-proof lying on its side instead of right side up. This *must* be changed—which is why these writements have made such a point of certifying the tops of illustrations, both in copy and on engraver's proof.

If you take out words, pad with an equivalent number of words. If you add, delete an equivalent number. Make every endeavor that all alterations may be made within a given page. If you have inserted or deleted a comma but made no other change on that page, ask yourself whether the alteration is necessary; the cost of handling that page added to the relatively slight cost of changing the comma will make the change pretty expensive. Keep in mind that all that has been or could be said about the cost of alterations in galley-proof applies doubly and triply to page-proof. Keep in mind also that author's alterations represent sheer waste.

Just a paragraph to summarize the exchange of

proofs: manuscript coming from author to publisher requires first-class postage. Manuscript and proof traveling together may, however, be sent parcel-post. The original manuscript goes back to the author with two sets of galleys—an original and a duplicate. He marks his corrections on the former (and may well copy them on the duplicate) and sends it and the manuscript back to the publisher. These “foul” galleys will be returned to him with page-proof. The author must make no further marks on foul galleys. Any corrections won’t be seen anyhow, and the foul galley is part of the record which must not be tampered with; in case of any dispute the record must be unimpaired or it is worthless. The same is true of any foul proof, or of foul manuscript. The author returns foul galleys with corrected page-proof to the publisher. The principle of foul proof always traveling with fresh proof holds true of any revises of page-proof that may be exchanged.

Remember that proof is only proof, not a finished product. Page-proof is pulled on cheap paper, and the illustrations will be smudgy, especially half-tones. Light and dark spots may appear in the type. No alarm need be felt.

X. *The Book Complete* —*And Revising It*

WITH the return of page-proof, complete with index, the author has nothing to do but sit back and wait for bound copies to be placed in his hands. He may become impatient, for apparently there is little more to be done by the printer. Wherefore it is desirable to see just what has to be done to transmute a manuscript into a finished book.

We may pass lightly over composition into type, for that portion of the work is well-recognized—so well that, to many, it is quite all there is to the making of a book. It is sufficient to note that for every letter, punctuation mark, character, or space between words, someone must punch a key. Consider a book of five hundred pages. There will be something like five hundred words to the page, and about three thousand characters and spaces. That means a million and a half punches. Even at twelve thousand punches an hour (a good operator can wangle this), it also means more than three weeks work for a single operator.

Much scientific work is done on the monotype machine, so all this key-punching produces nothing

but holes in a ribbon of paper. From these ribbons, the type is actually cast—and of course it takes time. There are also things the machines cannot do. There is always one page of display composition, the title-page, and there may be others. There are always numerous hand-set lines, also: chapter headings, sometimes sub-headings and running heads, lines or parts of lines in Greek type, and special matters of like sort.

The resulting galleys of the type must be proof-read and corrected; both processes take time. Galleys must be collated, i.e., subsidiary matter in a smaller type, formulas, etc., must be put into their appointed places; for these subsidiary matters cannot be set in order on the machine that is setting text. Another machine must do it, or the same machine at another time. Collation also uses up time.

At this point the author gets galley-proof. The proofs have to be pulled; time is consumed. Galleys come back to be corrected—more time; time in proportion to the extent of the correction and alteration. “Dirty” proofs of a book of five hundred pages may take as much as 250 hours or even more c.o.g. (correction-on-galley) time.

The type must then be made up into pages. A good make-up man will handle ten pages an hour; so there are about fifty hours make-up time on the book. Now the author gets page-proof; and the proof-boy spends more time.

When the author releases page-proof (but not a minute before), the stone-man can begin to impose,

i.e., arrange the pages of type and lock them into chases. Any uncertainty about the number and extent of the prelims delays the beginning of this process; for one can't successfully impose from the back to the front, nor begin in the middle and work both ways. To impose a 32-page form takes an hour, on the average. There are sixteen forms in the book, or nearly three days time for a single operator. Each form must be made ready on press, a process anterior to and distinct from running on press; the process consumes $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours for each form; call it 48 hours for the job—more than a week's time for a single operator. The presses will clip off fifteen hundred impressions an hour, once they get to running. How long it takes a book to be printed depends on the number of copies, naturally. Press-run on a book of five hundred pages, printed in 32's, will consume some ten or twelve hours per thousand copies.

Even with the book in print, it is far from finished. Flat sheets emerge from the press, and these go to another machine to be folded. There must follow collation of the folded sheets into orderly array, a hand process; then the sewing of each group of sheets into a book and the trimming of the edges. And that is all—except that the books still have to be pressed and glued into the familiar stiff cloth cases and stamped with the title.

How much actual time elapses between release of page-proof and receipt by the author of a bound copy depends, in any given case, on such factors as

the number of operations and machines available for the job during the interval and the receipt, in due season and good order, of the requisite amount of paper from the mill. Considering however the number of operations and the fact that they must be consecutive, it is clear that getting a book out is no overnight matter, even after it is set in type.

With a complete book in his hand, the author's woes and anxieties attendant upon seeing a book through press are at an end. He may find, upon perusal, some slips of pen or mind which have eluded all his vigilance. This is especially likely to be true if copy was something less than fair at the outset. The old overworked metaphor is still good: if you pour a bag of sand in the river upstream in the hope of taking it out downstream, you are pretty certain to miss a few grains.

These slips may be important enough to justify an erratum-slip, to be tipped in at the front of the book. Truly they need to be important to justify such an admission of failure. It is a quite unsatisfactory cure, for necessarily many copies will be distributed before the slip can be prepared and inserted. Consider that fact; consider also that even of the copies in the publisher's hands, many may be already packed for shipment against the day of purchase and thus beyond reach of an erratum slip; consider further that the really costly part of the slip is not the printing of it, but the slow one-by-one business of pasting one slip in each book—and do not hastily conclude that an erratum-slip is essential.

Demand may make necessary a reprinting of the book. If so, the publisher will ask the author for a list of corrections, should any errors have been discovered. This is not an opportunity to rewrite certain chapters or paragraphs, for such changes throw the book into the twilight zone between a reprinting and a second edition. The correction of mistakes is in order—only this and nothing more.

One good way to do it is to mark the corrections in a copy of the book (be sure it's the latest printing) just as page-proof is marked. Don't forget to use the margins. Maybe the publisher can furnish a damaged copy or a set of collated unbound sheets for the purpose. On the fly-leaf or on an accompanying sheet of paper, list the page-numbers, in numerical order, of the pages on which corrections appear. Nothing more is necessary.

A great deal more is necessary if you revise for a new edition. You are not, in this case, merely polishing up the diction or correcting the slips—if that is all that is necessary, a reprinting (without polishing up), not a new edition, is indicated. A new edition presupposes that what you have said is, in some significant particulars, out of date; that you have *passé* matters to eliminate, or new material to add, or both.

If you are kindly disposed, you will ask the publisher whether your book is in plates, standing type, or to be entirely reset, and govern yourself accordingly. If the new edition is to be reset, you are as free as in the case of original publication. If the

type is standing, your consideration for the publisher's purse will hamper you somewhat; you will wish to let him get as much good as he can from the standing type. If the book is plated, you will be hampered still further—indeed much further. Incidentally, we plump here for the idea that any material subject to revision should not be plated unless no dependence is placed on the plates for the printing of succeeding editions or the press-run for a single edition is high enough to warrant or demand plates. Plates are an unreasonable curtailment of the author's freedom.

Doubtless there is more than one way to go about a revision, and the technique may be dictated by the scope and character of the revision. In the vast majority of cases however, this procedure will serve nicely:

Procure two copies of the latest printing, and paste each page of the book, firmly on all edges, to sheets of paper $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 inches, so that there is ample margin top and bottom and on both sides. Any cheap paper will do. It must take ink without creeping, and it must be of a color to contrast with the ink used; in short, a paper on which you can write legibly.

The publisher may be able to furnish these copies from damaged stock or to furnish two sets of unbound signatures. Indeed if you smile upon him or the printer winsomely and ask nicely, he may furnish you with the whole paste-up, though there is nothing in the statute-books that requires him to do so.

Mark changes on these sheets just as if they were

proof, as indeed they may be—proof of what is in standing type. If you wish to cast out an entire page or even a series of pages, don't remove it or them. The printer will be perplexed about your intent. Draw a heavy diagonal line through the deleted portions or pages and mark "kill" in the margin.

Use the customary proof-reader's marks in making your emendations. Write new matter legibly in the wide margin provided by the sheet on which the page is pasted. Be careful not to obliterate the folios (page-numbers) on the pasted pages, and don't alter them.

If new material is too extensive to go upon the margin, type it on manuscript paper, just as original manuscript was typed, and let the typed sheets follow the page in which the new material is to be inserted. Designate each of these inserts, at the head of the first page of each, as "Insert A" (or B, or C, etc.), and in the same place state the number of pages in the insert and the page on which it is to be inserted, e.g., "Insert A—4 pages—p. 96." In this example, on page 96 you would write in the margin "Insert A," circle it, and draw an arrow to the exact point where the insert is to begin. Number the pages of each insert from one up.

Substituted material of greater extent than will go on the margin is handled as new material is. Be careful to delete the material substituted for.

The completed revise becomes the manuscript of a new book. It is doubly important to give this manuscript a *painstaking, scrupulous final reading* before it

goes to the publisher. Unless the book is so cut up as to require stringing out the whole on galleys, you will receive galley-proof only of the long inserts of new and substituted material; the remainder will come to you in page-proof. You are therefore further along in the process than in the case of a pristine manuscript. So make the new material as right as possible, and be quite sure about all your corrections on the margins.

If type is standing, you can be very helpful in recognizing the fact: making only such changes as are necessary; "saving" pages by padding-out if words are deleted or taking out some if additions are made. However once an addition obviously over-runs a page, you can forget standing type until the end of the chapter is reached—then bring it back out of the sub-conscious. In short "save" as many pages as possible. As on page-proof, if the only change is a minor one such as a comma, delete the correction. Maybe you can make a dicker with the publisher to divide with you any savings your care may make possible in the sum he predetermines as a proper one for the preparation cost (all the cost involved up to the time the presses start running) of the revised edition.

In the case of a revised edition, the question of author's alterations is tricky. Any alterations the author may make in the printed text is not an author's alteration but an alteration properly chargeable to the cost of revision. But any alteration he makes of an alteration, or any alteration in new material, is an

author's alteration. In general, all alterations made after submission of the revision (except, of course, errors of transcription of new material) will be charged as author's alterations. It therefore behooves the author to see that his revision is what he wants before the printer so much as gets a look at it.

PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

W. 2469